

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 14 are independent. By the foregoing Amendment, claims 1, 4, and 14 have been amended and claims 18-20 have been added. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter and their entry is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0088655 to Leigh et al. (hereinafter “*Leigh*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element of the claim is found, either expressly or inherently, in a reference. (MPEP §2131 *citing Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628 (Fed. Cir. 1987)). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Id. citing Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Embodiments of the claimed invention are directed to OS Agnostic Resource Sharing Across Multiple Servers. Independent claim 1 recites in pertinent part “routing input data generated at a first server blade to a second server blade, said input data generated in response to receiving an input signal produced by an input device coupled to a first server blade; and providing the input data to an operating system running on the second serve blade, *wherein routing input data to the first and second server blades and providing the input data to the operating system are performed via a first firmware and a second firmware on the first and second server blades, respectively*” (emphasis added). Independent claims 4 and 14 recite language similar to the emphasized language.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that *Leigh* discloses at paragraph [0030], lines 5-11, routing input data generated at a first computing platform to a second computing platform, said input data generated in response to receiving an input signal produced by an input device

coupled to a first computing platform, and at paragraph [0036], lines 1-8, and paragraph [0037], lines 13-15, providing the input data to an operating system running on the second computing platform. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Leigh appears to disclose KVM switches on several server blades. The server blades appear to be daisy-chained from one blade to another. In *Leigh*, there are local management controllers (LMC) on each server blade. At best, *Leigh* uses the LMCs for communication, however, there is no indication that the LMCs include firmware or that any communications between and/or among blades is facilitated using firmware on each of the server blades. Thus “routing input data to the first and second server blades and providing the input data to the operating system are performed via a first firmware and a second firmware on the first and second server blades, respectively” as recited in the claimed invention is not disclosed in *Leigh*. Because this element is not disclosed in *Leigh*, *Leigh* fails to disclose the identical invention recited in claims 1, 4, and 14 and claims 1, 4, and 14 are therefore patentable over *Leigh*.

Claims 2-3 and 5-8 properly depend from claim 1 and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable. Claims 11-13 properly depend from claim 4 and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 4 is patentable. Claim 17 properly depends from claim 14 and is thus patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 14 is patentable. (MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988))). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 1-8, 11-15, and 17.

Rejection of Claims 9-10 and 16 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Leigh* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. US 2004/0128562 to Bigelow et al. (hereinafter “*Bigelow*”) and claim 16 over *Leigh* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,114,180 to DeCaprio (hereinafter “*DeCaprio*”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9-10 properly depend from claim 4 and are thus patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 4 is patentable. Claim 16 properly depends from claim 14 and is thus

patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 14 is patentable. (MPEP §2143.03 (citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988))). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and remove the rejection to claims 9-10 and 16.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if the Examiner believes that an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

/October 21, 2008/
Date

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(206) 292-8600

/Jan Little-Washington/
Jan Little-Washington
Reg. No. 41,181

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below.

/Kristy A. Marvel/ October 21, 2008
Kristy A. Marvel **Date**